
Shifting from a Teacher-Centred to a Student-Centred Approach in the General Education of Georgia: Attitudes and Classroom Practices of Teachers

Anastasia Kitiashvili

Associate Professor, Faculty of psychology and educational sciences Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia.

Corresponding author email id: Anastasia.kitiashvili@tsu.ge

Date of publication (dd/mm/yyyy): 27/12/2020

Abstract – Student-centred teaching has replaced the teacher-centred approach in many Western countries as an effective tactic offering positive consequences for both learners and teachers. Due to an intensive reform process, the student-centred approach is widely acknowledged among teachers and institutions in Georgia, but little is known as to how successfully they have implemented the practice. The aim of this research was to analyse attitudes of teachers toward using a student-centred approach in general education of Georgia and to examine their practice in the classroom. The research sample included 30 schools in Tbilisi, 180 surveyed teachers, and 60 observed lessons. Though some positive changes can be observed, the overall implementation of a student-centred approach is still a challenge; existing changes are not comprehensive enough to produce a fundamental influence over common teaching practices. Positive attitudes towards using a student-centred teaching approach have been formed among many teachers, although only partly implemented by them in practice. According to the theory of planned behaviour, attitudes are predispositions to certain types of behaviour, although behavioural achievement depends on other factors as well, such as motivation and ability. In terms of the Normative Theory of Social Change, the majority of teachers still endorse a teacher-centred approach to education; in order to adopt a student-centred approach among the majority, a superficial compliance among in the majority is insufficient. A genuine internalization of change is required to change the common practice.

Keywords – Attitudes, Teaching Practice, Student-Centred Teaching, Teacher-Centred Teaching.

I. INTRODUCTION

Debates concerning the best educational practices have become a key issue in mainstream dialogues among social scientists for a long time; recently, student-centred teaching has been recognised as the most effective approach, offering positive consequences for learning and teaching (Darling, 1994). Thus, it is progressively being encouraged in education; student-centred teaching has replaced the teacher-centred approach in many Western countries (McCombs & Whistler, 1997).

Student-centred and teacher-centred learning approaches derive from two different philosophical schools of thought which have inspired educators' divergent views of learning. The teacher-centred approach is rooted in the psychology of behaviourism and positivist philosophy. According to the Behaviourist approach (epitomized by E.L. Watson, E.R. Thorndike and B.F. Skinner), learning can develop by establishing a relationship between stimulus and behaviour, and any behaviour can be changed through reinforcement. Behaviourists addressed learning as a mechanical process and gave particular importance to objectivity. They believed that due to the right environmental influences, all learners can gain a similar understanding and learn new materials. Experiences and environmental factors make up the human personality. According to the positivist philosophy, knowledge can be acquired simply through observation (Giddens, 1974). In this sense, learning is considered as

a rigid scientific inquiry. Positivists do not rely on subjective experience.

The student-centred approach has its roots in the school of “constructivism” (Piaget, 1973; Vygotsky, 1978). It is a theory of learning, and not a “cook book teaching style” (Fostnot, 1996). According to constructivism people must construct their own version of reality while transforming it, and themselves in the process, rather than just copying knowledge (Garfield, 1995). Piaget’s main idea was that children are active thinkers, constantly trying to construct a more advanced understanding of their world. Vygotsky’s (1978) emphasized on the social environment effecting on the development of thoughts, beliefs and behaviours of children. According to social scientists (Cobb et al., 1992), the individual’s cognitive structures cannot be understood without observing their social factors. Rogers (1983), in his book *Freedom to Learn for the ‘80s*, describes the shift in power from the expert teacher to the student learner, driven by a need for a change in the traditional environment: within this ‘so-called educational atmosphere, students become passive, apathetic and bored’. According to Froebel, the teacher should not ‘interfere with this process of maturation, but act as a guide’ (Simon, 1999, as cited in O’Neill & McMahon, 2005, p. 27).

Teacher-centred teaching doesn’t encourage students to express themselves, ask questions, and direct their own learning. Teacher-centred pedagogy is linked with top-down and hierarchal pedagogy; it reinforces passive learning as students must place all of their focus upon the teacher. Teachers provide instruction while learners passively receive it. The teacher transmits knowledge as an expert to the students as novices. Teachers usually use particular textbooks; most of the questions raised by students are answered directly by teachers without students’ involvement or discussion (Acat & Donmez, 2009). Because teachers direct all classroom activities, they don’t have to worry that students will miss any important topics. The advantage of teacher-centred learning is that it is suitable for large classes, it takes less time to complete the class activities; the main focus is on transferring knowledge to the learners.

Contrary to teacher-centred learning, a student-centred approach creates a personalized learning environment, where teachers have high expectations of students and take into consideration the learners’ individual needs and styles (Reigeluth & Duffy, 2008; DiMartino, Clark, & Wolk, 2003; McCombs & Whistler, 1997). Students feel accepted and supported; learning is based on participation. The more actively learners can participate, the more they are empowered and responsible for their learning. The teacher has the role of a moderator (Reigeluth, 1994; McCombs & Whisler, 1997; Weimer, 2002; Cornelius-White & Harbaugh, 2010;). Teachers provide feedback on learners’ progress and carry out assessments for improving students learning; learners develop self-assessment skills (McCombs & Whisler, 1997; Weimer, 2002).

There are some critiques towards student-centred teaching, such as: while the teacher is primarily focused on the individual learner, he or she may not be able to take into account the needs of the whole class (Simmon, 1999). Some researches show concern over students being abandoned or isolated from other supports within a student-centred learning approach (Lea et al., 2003). Challenges related to its implementation may occur, such as a lack of resources, or negative attitudes of students and staff. For example, the European Union, United States and Canada spend extensive amounts on resources to support a student-centred approach at all levels of education. It should be noted that the student-centred approach is more a Western approach to learning that requires monetary resources and might be less relevant to countries with limited resources. In addition, it is a slow process that needs time to develop fully, and results can be expected only after the real internalization of t-

-his concept and not a mere mechanical adherence.

The Context of Georgia

During the last decade, Georgia has been undergoing a reform process in education, together with a new way of conceptualizing education. In the past, Georgia, as one of the post-Soviet countries, relied on a teacher-centred approach; Soviet education was a unified system, where the standardized curricula, textbooks and methods of teaching-assessment were determined by the Ministry of Education, and every school followed standardized guidelines. Since 1999, several initiatives have been implemented in general education in Georgia to improve the quality of education; among them were support for the implementation of teaching and assessment approaches that stimulate thinking and reasoning of students; teacher professional development and training and other progressive concepts. Georgia expressed openness to Western values, promoting a predominantly student-centred teaching. The country has shared Western teaching approach, for example students centered approach, active learning an etc. Reforms in education are supported by the World Bank, and foundations such as Soros, EU, UNICEF, etc. Consequently, in the last decade there have been many implemented reforms to facilitate a shift towards a student-centred approach and active teaching. Teachers and students were introduced to a new concept of learning and were encouraged to debate the merits of the two approaches. Due to the intensive reform process, the student-centred approach is widely acknowledged among teachers and institutions in Georgia, though the majority of them could not implement this approach. Only a fraction of all working teachers were able to adapt this concept within their practice.

Although Georgia has improved its testing results during the period of 2010 to 2015, still more than half of the Georgian students could achieve only the low level skills. According to results from OECD's PISA tests, administered for three consecutive rounds in 2010, 2015 and 2018, the share of 15-year-olds who could achieve only the lowest level of proficiency (OECD, 2019) was over 50 percent. Furthermore, the most recent PISA 2018 results have shown that the share of lowest achievers has risen again: up to 64% in reading, 61% in science, and 64% in mathematics. There is evidence that the lack of key competences will have an effect on the lives of pupils, and will limit their further learning capacity, whether they leave education or continue studying in Vocational Education and Training or higher education.

One of the research studies carried out in Georgia (Kitiashvili, 2014) found that physical environment – of classroom arrangement, teaching style and assessment methods used by the teachers are more relevant to a passive learning approach than a student-centred one. In most of the classrooms (92.0%) desks were traditionally arranged in rows. Moreover, the research revealed that a mismatch between teachers' self-assessment and practice; they believed that the largest amount of time in the classroom was devoted to active teaching and assessment; according to the study, 71.4 percent of the teachers use at least one interactive teaching method during a lesson. These methods were: practice/ Exercise, discussion, instruction/ demonstration, role playing and projects.

The main forms of teaching were practice and discussion. Although students were given limited possibilities of interaction with each other in a group work format and limited opportunities to participate in high-level cognitive activities while most discussions were implemented through question-and-answer between teachers and students; and.

Other research shows that teachers had a positive attitude toward using cognitively complex teaching and ass-

-essment approaches and expressed willingness to use such assessment methods in their classes, but under observation, they mainly used methods of questioning and prompting students that required lower-level cognitive activity (Kitiashvili, Abashidze, Zhvania, 2015). Most of the questions (75.2 %) asked by the teachers were closed, while only 24.8 % are open-ended.

Research Problem

Though the term student-centred approach is widely used, according to Lea et al. “many institutions or educators claim to be putting student-centred learning into practice, but in reality, they are not” (2003:322).

There is a lack of research on teaching practice in Georgia. Given the background of the reforms and the research results, it is important to study whether the current approaches in general education support the use of student-centred teaching.

Research Aim and Research Questions

The aim of this article is to study teachers’ attitudes toward using teacher-centred approach and their teaching practices in Georgia’s general educational institutions.

Thus, the research questions are as follows:

1. What kind of attitudes do teachers hold in relation to using a student-centred approach in general education?
2. What kind of teaching practices are teachers actually using in the classroom? Are these practices relevant to the student-centred approach?
3. How closely are teachers’ attitudes toward a student-centred approach relate to teachers’ real practices?

The research results can be used for evaluation of classroom practice as well as for planning appropriate interventions to support student-centred teaching.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

General Background

The research was carried out in 30 schools in Tbilisi, capital of Georgia in 2019. For the sampling, a random sampling method was used.

Sample

The research were conducted with 180 teachers and 60 lessons were observation. The sampling of subjects by the level of general education is given in table 1.

Table 1. Sample of the observation by subjects and a level of the general education.

	Subject	Elementary	Basic Education	Secondary	Total
1	Georgian language	3	3	3	9
2	Math	3	3	3	9
3	History	2	2	3	7
4	Geography	3	2	2	7

	Subject	Elementary	Basic Education	Secondary	Total
5	Chemistry	2	3	2	7
6	Physics	3	2	2	7
7	Biology	2	3	2	7
8	Foreign language	2	2	3	7
	Total	20	20	20	60

The average age of teacher was 45 years ($SD = 10.71$, age range = 21–78 years). Whereas 85% of the interviewed teachers were women, only 15 % were men. More than half (60%) of the teachers were less than 50 years old or younger, while 40% percent were 51 or older.

More than 75 % of teachers have more than 11 years of experience of working as a teacher (minimum 1 year and maximum 49 years). About 95% of teachers have higher education, 3% VET and 2% PHD. Teachers teach on average 16 hours per week ($SD = 6$; minimum 2 hours and maximum 30 hours).

The total number of students in all classes was about 1320. The study showed that the average number of students in a class is 22, ($SD = 7.4$; minimal 8 students and maximum 48 students). Although the average number of students is within the prescribed limits regulated by the National Curriculum, in some cases the number of students exceeds the limit. On average, 19 students attended the lessons ($SD = 7.05$, range = 5–34 students). On average 4 students did not attend the classes ($SD = 4.2$). Gender balance between the female and male students was 10:9.

Instrument and Procedures

The research was carried out using a survey research method and structured observation. Observation and survey research were carried out at the same time. A survey was conducted using a specially developed questionnaire, that covered the following information: demographic data of the teachers, reflections on classroom practices, teaching and assessment, and main obstacles facing teaching processes. Questionnaires were distributed among schoolteachers and they were asked to fill in them independently. All teachers who were observed participated in a survey researched.

The observation was carried out using specifically designed observation instrument.

In each school, 2 lessons were observed based on the random sampling. It used a passive observation strategy, meaning that 2 observers sat at the last desk in the classroom and did not interfere, but simply observed the processes and filled in a special observation forms. After the observation, the observation results were analysed and only matched observations between the observers were included in the analysis while unmatched results between the observers were deleted.

The observation was conducted based on the following categories:

1. Physical environment – classroom arrangement, teaching materials, and so on;
2. Classroom management;
3. Teaching and assessment approach- teachers' attitudes and practice.

The anonymity of surveyed teachers was ensured during the research. Observation data were coded, which did not allow for the identification of any specific teachers or schools.

Data Analysis

All observed lessons were audio-taped and transcribed to perform analysis. Later observers destroyed all audio materials in their possession. The data was analysed using SPSS 26 and a content analysis.

III. RESEARCH RESULTS

Physical Environment

The study revealed that most of the classrooms (75%) are arranged traditionally. In 30 percent of the classrooms are the desks placed in the circle or in small groups. This layout of desks, chairs and tables is more in line with traditional teaching than active. Students are sitting in rows and the teacher's table in front. In 20 percent of the observed classes, desks are placed too close to each other, while in 80 percent, they are arranged normally. During observation the usage of teaching materials was recorded. Table 2 indicates that blackboard and chalk/marker are available and consequently used most often. Subject-relevant visual materials are not available in 60.0 % of the observed lessons. Laptop/ computer or a projector is available only in few cases.

Table 2. Use of teaching materials during the observed lessons percentage.

Resources	Is available but not used, %	Is available and used, %	Not available %	Total
Blackboard Chalk/marker	10	90		100
Subject-relevant visual material (models, tools, and etc.)	5	35	60	100
Computer/laptop	3	40	55	100

Among the assessment methods the most frequently used method is discussion/asking questions (100.0%), followed by checking homework (85%), doing exercises on the blackboard (65.0%), presentations (15%) and written individual assignments (at the desk) (10%). There were no cases where portfolio methods were used.

Classroom Management

Teachers mostly tried to involve all students in the teaching, although a part of the teachers (20%) still had a certain number of the students beyond their attention. This was especially common in large classrooms.

Learning activity accounted for a total of 76% of class time. This includes the following activities: lesson explanation and assessment, reading and writing, individual and group work, etc.

The teacher uses oral instructions and classroom management strategies during the lesson, which were relatively common at the beginning and end of the lesson. It was with the help of the instructions that the teachers tried to get the students' attention, which was mainly related to giving assignments and instructions.

According to the observational data, about 5.0% of students are involved in other, non-class activities during the whole lesson (looking out the window, playing, reading other material), and 8 % spend time interacting with other students, laughing, which only happens in small groups (3-4 students).

Most of the lessons were not a problem of discipline, there was less noise and the lesson was going smoothly.

There was an impression that there were already established norms between the teacher and the students; students were followed by the students, for example, raising their hands during the answer, not getting up from the desk or going to the blackboard without permission, helping the teacher when handing out notebooks or any materials.

In the case of a discipline problem, the teacher used different approaches: calling the students to establish order, reminding them of the rules of behavior, addressing the student who violated the order by name, used non-verbal behaviours. The teacher rarely raised his/her voice. No physical punishment was observed in any of the lessons during the observation process.

Attitudes of Teachers towards using Students-centred teaching and their Teaching Practice

The findings of the survey study show that teachers have a positive attitude toward using student centered approach and stimulating the comprehension of students through questions.

About 90% think that lessons should not be focused on transmission only knowledge; the process should be active and based on the interaction between students and teachers. Lessons should be motivating for the students

About 85 % of Teachers point out that students were actively involves in classroom activities. Participation in discussions and debates was pointed by the same number of teachers; 80% pointed about participation in projects; They think that they are active for 16 minutes while about 28 minutes students.

Teachers evaluated their competencies to implement active teaching as 8.5 on the 10 point scale.

Lessons were analyzed according to Bloom’s Taxonomy. Table 3 shows that teachers asked questions to verify a student's knowledge or recollection of what has been taught. The second most important purpose of asking questions was to check if students had sufficiently comprehended the material and its interpretation. Teachers’ questions did not check if students cloud solve new problems, analyze information, find explanations or to evaluate methods or specific opinions.

Table 3. Type of questions.

Type of question	%
Knowledge	61.3
Comprehension	25
Application	3.8
Analysis	4.8
Synthesis	2.5
Evaluation	2.5
Total	100

This analysis shows that 64 % of the questions asked by the teachers are closed, and 36% are open. Therefore, closed questions were asked much more often than open questions.

The majority of teachers do not wait enough to allow pupils to provide their understanding. Other research also shows (Black & Wiliam, 1998) that in such a situation, only a few students can provide correct answers while others may stay passive in the process.

There is a correspondence between teachers positive attitudes toward using cognitively complex assessment approaches and their willingness to use such assessment methods in their classes. The research revealed that discussion used by teachers was mostly carried out through question-and-answer between teachers and small groups of students. According to the literature, when students have enough knowledge and skills about the topic teachers ask well-phrased and well-timed questions, discussion can be a very effective method of teaching. If these conditions are not met, it can become a non-effective technique (Glawson & Haskins, 2006) and it becomes a ritual (Black & Wiliam, 1998).

According to the study, 75 % of the teachers used at least one interactive teaching method during a lesson. However, it predominantly happens in the form of discussion.

The majority of teachers (98 %) thought that it was essential to provide feedback on student work; while about 60% of teachers gave feedback on students homework or assignments.

In most cases, the lesson ended with assignment. In about 1/5 of the cases, the teacher wrote and announced the mark; Most of the cases teachers ask questions about whether something was unclear.

Observation showed that teachers used quite a lot of activities in a short period of time. For example, 2-4 activities were observed for 5 minutes, both individual and group, which hindered the students' concentration on the task and their involvement.

Barriers of Teaching

Among the barriers of teaching 75% of teachers named the size of the classes. They think that the maximum number of students per class should be no more than 15-16.

Another factor was a lack of continuous professional development; Teachers attended on average 3.5 trainings during last 3 years. 90% of them evaluated training as effective, but teachers would like to have more trainings about modern teaching and evaluation methods and classroom management.

Teachers also named a lack of networking with colleagues outside of the school. On average they had this opportunity once a month.

IV. DISCUSSION

Below is given the comparison among the Teacher–Centred and Person–Centred Classrooms and the results of research.

The results shows (see table 4) that teachers mostly use a teacher-centred approach but there are some elements of the student-centred approach as well; thus we can say that the teaching model in Georgia is more a hybrid model. Some researchers suggest that classroom management can be considered on a continuum from teacher-centred to student-centred where most of the cases fall in the middle range.

Table 4. Teacher–Centred and Person–Centred Classrooms and Situation in Georgia.

Teacher-centred	Student-centred	Situation in Georgia
Teacher is the sole leader	Leadership is shared	Teacher mostly is the sole leader
Management is a form of oversight	Management is a form of guidance	Management is a form of oversight

Teacher-centred	Student-centred	Situation in Georgia
Teacher takes responsibility for all the paperwork and organization	Students are facilitators for the operations of the classroom	Teacher takes responsibility for most of the paperwork and organization but involves students, too
Discipline comes from the teacher	Discipline comes from the self	Discipline comes from the teacher
A few students are the teacher's helpers	A few students are the teacher's helpers	A few students are the teacher's helpers
Teacher makes the rules and posts them for all students	Rules are developed by the teacher and students in the form of a constitution or compact	Teacher makes the rules and posts them for all students but solicits their agreement to the rules
Consequences are fixed for all students	Consequences reflect individual differences	Consequences are fixed for most of the students with some cases reflecting individual differences
Rewards are mostly extrinsic	Rewards are mostly intrinsic	Rewards are mostly extrinsic
Students are allowed limited responsibilities	Students share in classroom responsibilities	Students are allowed limited responsibilities

Note. The table is taken from *Freedom to Learn*, 3rd Edition (p. 240), by C. Rogers and H. J. Frieberg, 1994. Columbus: Merrill Publishing except the third column.

Despite an intensive and lengthy educational reform process, using student centred and intensive methods of teaching still presents a challenge. The teacher-as-expert approach is no longer considered by many teachers to be the only successful approach, and its relevance to the new social and educational context is under question. But, at the same time, the student-centred approach has not been adopted by the majority of teachers; only a minority of teachers, students and institutions have implemented it.

If we compare the results of the current research and the evidence from 2014, we can see some improvements in these directions: fewer classrooms are arranged traditionally in rows of desks (75% vs 92%); more teachers utilize interactive teaching (75% vs 71.4%); they pose more open-ended questions (36% vs 24.8%) and there is more focus on cognitively complex issues (evaluation (2.5% vs 1.9%) and synthesis (2.5% vs 0.9%)), but all these changes are not comprehensive enough to produce fundamental changes in Georgian teaching practices.

The findings of this study showed that teachers hold a positive attitude toward adopting teaching methods that stimulate students' cognitive skills. There is congruence between teachers' attitude and self-reflection, yet there is a discrepancy between teachers' attitudes, self-reflections and behaviour. Teachers fall back upon cognitively lower-level teaching and assessment approaches; Students were not asked to solve problems, create something new or original, or to develop their answers in depth. Similarly, students were not systematically involved in group work and collaborative learning. Similar results have been identified in PISA research.

Shifting from a teacher-as-expert approach to a student-centred approach requires that teachers, as well as students, must change their thinking patterns and actions towards education.

In order to succeed at implementation, teachers need to study the model's principles, as well as arrive at a genuine recognition of its value. In changing their practice, teachers first need to alter their old beliefs and

attitudes; they can set new standards and plan active lessons, taking into account students' needs. Research shows that (Clark & Peterson, 1986; Pajares, 1992; Calderhead, 1996;) teachers' conceptions of pedagogical practice influence not only how they teach, but how students learn as well. Teachers need to use an approach that would allow students to use higher cognitive skills, and discuss their thinking within pairs or small groups. Teaching must be interactive. Teachers need to change their conception of the role of the teacher to include interactions with the class, and to guide students in their active learning process (Frenay et al., 1998). Rather, this method of pedagogy combines various techniques, to shift the role of the teacher from singular source of knowledge and information to facilitator of learning. Technology can support changing the learning context from teacher-centred to learner-centred activities, giving students more control over content, creating a more collaborative learning environment, and providing different ways of accessing information and communicating with people.

Rogers and Freiberg (1999) suggest that a shift from a teacher-centred to a student-centred approach requires teachers to accept an orientation toward classroom management, which features shared leadership, and balances the needs of teachers and students. Classroom management is a multidimensional concept that includes the organization of the physical space, the development of effective relationships, and the prevention of and response to misbehaviour. Teachers need to strengthen management strategies of articulating clear expectations, while modelling or providing instruction on desired procedures.

Students also need to adopt a new conception of the learning process. To meet the needs of the changing world, they must change their long-time practice from passive to active learning. They need to gain control over their learning environment and take responsibility for personal progress, becoming autonomous in the learning process.

What we observe in Georgia is that the attitude of teachers towards using a student-centred teaching approach has been theoretically accepted among many teachers, but only partly implemented in daily practice. The lack of correspondence between teachers' attitudes and behaviour can be explained by the Planned Behaviour theory (Ajzen, & Madden, 1986; Ajzen, 1991). Though attitudes are predispositions to behaviour, behavioural achievement depends jointly on other factors as well, such as motivation (intentions – indications of how hard people are willing to try, of how much of an effort they plan to exert, to adopt the behaviour) and ability (behavioural control – confidence of a person in his or her ability to perform the behaviour). Besides having a positive attitude, teachers also need to make many changes to their thinking and acquire the relevant skills to implement a student-centred approach.

Some teaching approaches are still construed in a similar way to those common in early transitional years of the 1990s, and have not been impacted by the student-centred approach. The Soviet system was effective within the economic and social context of that time. The philosophy of education during the Soviet period conformed to societal norms defined by the majority (80%) (de la Sablonnie R., et al., 2009). In terms of the normative theory of social change, the majority of teachers endorsed a teacher-centred approach to education (de la Sablonnie R., et al., 2009). Because the minority of educators promoting the student-centred approach do not have the benefit of widespread support, they have to be acutely aware of their message as compared to those favouring the traditional teacher-as-expert approach, who may try to exert influence over them.

The process of minority influence over changing educational norms should be further supported in adopting a

student-centred approach. There is no guarantee that minority views will have a positive influence on the concepts of the majority. But if the minority is successful, changes can be powerful and widely internalized. The majority first should achieve genuine attitude change, and later on a change in behaviour (Moscovici et al., 1994). The change should not be merely superficial compliance in majority preference, but the genuine internalization of new ideas, and a more elastic worldview that allows for long-lasting changes.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The findings of this study showed that teachers hold a positive attitude toward adopting teaching methods that stimulate students' cognitive skills. There is congruence between teachers' attitude and self-reflection, yet there is a discrepancy between teachers' attitudes, self-reflections and behaviour. Teachers fall back upon cognitively lower-level teaching and assessment approaches, and cognitive complexity is rarely required. Students were not asked to solve problems, create something new or original, or to develop their answers in depth. Similarly, students were not systematically involved in group work and collaborative learning. Similar results have been identified in PISA research. Thus the results shows that teachers mostly use a teacher-centred approach but there are some elements of the student-centred approach; thus we can say that the teaching model in Georgia is moving towards a hybrid model.

Attitude of teachers towards using a student-centred teaching approach has been theoretically accepted in Georgia among many teachers, but only partly implemented in daily practice. Ensuring the correspondence between student-centred policy initiatives and implementation is very important. The educational reform process should give more support to teachers seeking to implement genuine changes in their practice and not just superficial compliance with the instructions. The Georgian Ministry of Education, the main stakeholders, as well as schools and universities should work together to implement educational reforms and ensure that real changes occur in education. By working together, teachers and students can gradually transform the prevalent learning practice from a teacher-centred to a student-centred approach.

There is a need for the provision of relevant preconditions to support realization of the attitudes in practice, such as physical alterations in classroom environment, relevant resources and intensive professional development for pedagogues, in order to improve the experience of teachers using a student-centred approach. For a successful approach among teachers, various barriers must be taken into account. Teachers surveyed named the following barriers to teaching-assessment process: a lack of experience of active teaching methods; a lack of networking among teachers to share experience and best practices with colleagues. The large enrolments of classes, together with the physical classroom arrangement, created barriers to various group activities or dynamic learning sessions, posing a challenge to individualistic learning.

Successful implementation of a student-centred approach requires teachers to work on their professional development. Teacher preparation programs should cover the student-centred issue, with a focus on learning theory, establishing classroom environments that encourage student involvement and implementing peer review. Teachers will need to make many changes to their thinking, as well reflecting on their changes and challenges, considering how to balance guidance and freedom. Learner-centered teaching does not mean learning without a teacher (Lengkanawati in 2016); in contrary, teachers play a very important role in teaching but it is not necessary that every component of teaching to be learner-centered. The amount of time teachers spend

organizing and directing students, interacting with individual students, and dealing with inappropriate and disruptive behaviour is related to the type of activity and the physical arrangements of the setting. Student-centred instruction relies greatly on hands-on activities, projects, small group activities and discussion to encourage active participation of students.

REFERENCES

- [1] Acat, B., & Donmez, I. (2009). To compare student centred education and teacher centred education in primary science and technology lesson in terms of learning environments. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(1), 1805–1809. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2009.01.320>
- [2] Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-t](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-t)
- [3] Ajzen, I., & Madden, T.J. (1986). Prediction of goal-directed behavior: Attitudes, intentions, and perceived behavioral control. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 22(5), 453–474. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031\(86\)90045-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(86)90045-4)
- [4] Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). *Assessment and Classroom Learning. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5(1), 7–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102>
- [5] Calderhead, J. (1996). Teachers: Beliefs and knowledge. In D. Berliner & R. Calfee (Eds.) *Handbook of research on educational psychology*. New York, NY: Macmillan, 709-725.
- [6] Cobb, P., Yackel, E., & Wood, T. (1992). A Constructivist alternative to the representational view of Mind in Mathematics Education. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 23(1), 2, 2-23 <https://doi.org/10.2307/749161>
- [7] Cornelius-White, J.H.D. & Harbaugh, A.P. (2010). *Learner-centered instruction: Building relationships for student success*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483349183>.
- [8] Darling, J. (1994). *Child-Centred Education: And Its Critics*. Sage Publications (CA) de la Sablonniere, R., Taylor, D.M., & Sadykova, N. (2009). Challenges of applying a student-centered approach to learning in the context of education in Kyrgyzstan. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 29(6), 628–634. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2009.01.001>
- [9] Fostnot, 1996. Fostnot, C.T. (1996). *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice*. New York: Teachers' College Press.
- [10] Frenay et al. (1998). Pour beaucoup d'étudiants, il s'agit d'étudier (enfin) des matières qu'ils ont choisies, donc qui vont les passionner (For many students, it is about studying (finally) the subjects they have chosen, therefore which will fascinate them) Wang, P. (2011). Constructivism and Learner Autonomy in Foreign Language Teaching and Learning: To what Extent does Theory Inform Practice? *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(3). <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.1.3.273-277>
- [11] Garfield, J., 1995. How students learn statistics. *International Statistical Review* 63 (1), 25–34, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1403775>
- [12] Garrett, T (2008). Student-Centered and Teacher-Centered Classroom management: A Case Study of Three Elementary Teachers. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 43(1), 34 – 47.
- [13] Giddens, A. (1974). *Positivism and Sociology*. Heinemann Glawson, J., G.S., & Haskins. M.E. (2006) *Teaching management: A field guide for professors, corporate trainers, and consultants*. Cambridge University Press.
- [14] Kitiashvili, A. (2014). Teachers' attitudes toward assessment of student learning and teacher assessment practices in general educational institutions: The case of Georgia. *Improving Schools*, 17(2), 163–175. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1365480214534543>
- [15] Kitiashvili, A., Abashidze, T., & Zhvania Irine (2015). Why and How Teachers ask Questions - Survey of Teachers' Attitudes and Classroom Practices in Georgian Public Schools. *GESJ: Education Science and Psychology*, 2(34), 62-76.
- [16] Lea, S., Stephenson, D., Troy, J (2010). Higher Education Students' attitudes to Student-centred Learning: Beyond 'educational bulimia'? *Studies in Higher Education*, 28 (3), 321-334.
- [17] Lea, S. J., Stephenson, D., & Troy, J. (2003). Higher Education Students' Attitudes to Student-centred Learning: Beyond "educational bulimia"? *Studies in Higher Education*, 28(3), 321–334. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070309293>
- [18] Jordan, L., Bovill, C., Othman, S.M., Saleh, A.M., Shabila, N.P., & Watters, N. (2013). Is student-centred learning a Western concept? Lessons from an academic development programme to support student-centred learning in Iraq. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 19(1), 13–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2013.827649>
- [19] Piaget, J. (1973). *Psychology and Epistemology: Towards a Theory of Knowledge*. Record: Rio de Janeiro
- [20] Tangney, S. (2013). Student-centred learning: a humanist perspective. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 19(3), 266–275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2013.860099>
- [21] McCombs, B.L., & Whisler, J.S. (1997). *The learner-centered classroom and school: Strategies for increasing student motivation and achievement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [22] Moscovici, S., Mucchi-Faina, A., Maass, A., (1994). *Minority Influence*. Nelson-Hall Publishers, Chicago.
- [23] Piaget, J. (1973). *Memory and Intelligence*. Basic Books, New York.
- [24] Rogers, C., & Freiberg, J. (1994). *Freedom to learn* (3rd Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Publishing.
- [25] Rogers, C.R. (1983). *Freedom to Learn for the 80s*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1177/074171367102100206>
- [26] Sharkey, S., & Weimer, M. (2003). Learner-Centered Teaching: Five Key Changes to Practice. *Teaching Sociology*, 31(2), 251. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3211318>
- [27] Simon, B. (1999). Why no pedagogy in England? In J. Leach and B. Moon (Eds.), *Learners and Pedagogy*. London: Sage Publications.
- [28] Skinner, B.F., 1953. *Science and Human Behavior*. Free Press, New York
- [29] Tangney, S. (2013). Student-centred learning: a humanist perspective. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 19(3), 266–275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2013.860099>
- [30] Vygotsky (1978) Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. *Readings on the development of children*, 23(3), 34-41.
- [31] Weimer, M. (2002). *Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- [32] Yurdabakan, İ. (2011). The View of Constructivist Theory on Assessment: Alternative Assessment Methods in Education. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi (University Journal of Educational Sciences)*, 051–077. https://doi.org/10.1501/egifak_0000001215.

AUTHOR'S PROFILE



Anastasia Kitiashvili is an Associate Professor at Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University (TSU) at the Department of Psychology, on the Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences. In 2009 She established a new direction of applied social psychology at the department together with the MA and PhD Programs; she is mentoring MA degree students thesis's work and PhD students. Since November 2016 she is a member of Academic Council of TSU, since 2012 SPSP. She has more than 15 year-experience in the field of psychology, Education and research; She has a solid experience working on the issue such as education and employment support of IDPs, ethnic minorities, woman, job-seekers, NEETs groups. She has a solid experience working with international organizations (UNDP, EU, ETF, IBF, MC -A and etc.) as a consultant, senior expert or as a team leader. Her research interests are: Attitudes and social behavior, Social identity, Access to education and employment of vulnerable groups, Mental Health and disability; Social inclusion, Stress and well-being. As a doctoral and post-doctoral researcher she has earned several scholarships at different Universities: University of Lausanne, University of Porto, Central European University.